

REMARKS

The Examiner indicates that Claims 1, 9 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter.

Claim 1, 8-9, 13-16 and 20-22 are objected for minor informalities. Applicant has respectfully amended the claims to overcome these informalities. As such, withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-23 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. For example, the rejection states that there is insufficient antecedent basis for “the completion,” as claimed. Applicant has respectfully amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 14. As such, independent Claims 1, 9 and 14 are in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Dependent claims are in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, by virtue of their dependency. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1, 9 and 14 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly incomplete for omitting essential elements. Applicant has adopted some of the Examiner’s suggestions. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner’s position that “a plurality of PRD (physical

region descriptor) data structures and a plurality of PCB (command parameter block) data structures” are essential elements.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the processor prepares the disk transaction information by packaging a plurality of data structures comprising the data transaction (see instant application, page 11 line 26 to page 12 line 1). For example, the data structures may include CPBs (command parameter blocks) and PRDs (physical region descriptors) for data transaction (see instant application, page 12, lines 2-4). Accordingly, PRDs and CPBs are merely illustrative examples of the data structure. Thus, the recited limitations of preparing disk transaction information by packaging a plurality of data structures comprising a disk transaction, as claimed are not missing essential elements, as alleged by the rejection. PRDs and CPBs are merely exemplary embodiments of the disk transaction. Accordingly, Claims 1, 9 and 14 are in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Dependent claims are in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph by virtue of their dependency. As such, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

As such, allowance of Claims 1-23 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected Claims 1-23 is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-23 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-23 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 3-23-2009

/Amir A. Tabarrok/
Amir A. Tabarrok
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113